

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
SOUTHERN DIVISION

RUPERT WARD, :
 :
 Plaintiff, :
 :
 vs. : CIVIL ACTION 10-0295-CG-C
 :
 WAYNE GRAY, :
 :
 Defendant. :

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Plaintiff, who is an Alabama prison inmate proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*), filed this § 1983 action (Doc. 1). This action has been referred to the undersigned pursuant 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 72.2(c)(4), and is now before the Court for Plaintiff's failure to prosecute and to obey the Court's Order (Doc. 19).

The Court's Order dated September 29, 2011 (Doc. 19) converted Defendant's Special Report and Answer to a motion for summary judgment and ordered Plaintiff to inform the Court by November 7, 2011, if he wanted to proceed with the prosecution of this action. Plaintiff was warned that his failure to respond would be considered by the Court as an abandonment of the prosecution of this action by him and that the action would be dismissed for failure to prosecute and to obey the Court's Order. Plaintiff's copy of the Court's Order has not been returned to the Court, nor has the Court, to date, heard from Plaintiff since the Order was entered. Plaintiff's copy of the Court's Order was sent to him at Fountain Correctional Center, Fountain 3800, Atmore, Alabama 36503, which was the last address that he furnished the Court and which is the current address for Plaintiff on the Alabama Department of Corrections' website.

Due to Plaintiff's failure to comply with the Court's Order, the undersigned concludes that Plaintiff has abandoned the prosecution of his action. Upon consideration of the alternatives available to the Court and of the time and resources expended by Defendants in defending this action, it is recommended that this action be dismissed with prejudice pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure as no other lesser sanction will suffice. See *Link v. Wabash R. R.*, 370 U.S. 626, 630, 82 S.Ct. 1386, 8 L.Ed.2d 734 (1962) (interpreting Rule 41(b) not to restrict the court's inherent authority to dismiss *sua sponte* an action for lack of prosecution); *World Thrust Films, Inc. v. International Family Entertainment, Inc.*, 41 F.3d 1454, 1456-57 (11th Cir. 1995); *Ballard v. Carlson*, 882 F.2d 93 (4th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, *Ballard v. Volunteers of America*, 493 U.S. 1084, 110 S.Ct. 1145, 107 L.Ed.2d 1049 (1990); *Mingo v. Sugar Cane Growers Co-op*, 864 F.2d 101, 102 (11th Cir. 1989); *Goforth v. Owens*, 766 F.2d 1533, 1535 (11th Cir. 1983); *Jones v. Graham*, 709 F.2d 1457, 1458 (11th Cir. 1983). Accord *Chambers v. NASCO, Inc.*, 501 U.S. 32, 111 S.Ct. 2123, 115 L.Ed.2d 27 (1991) (ruling that the federal courts' inherent power to manage their own proceedings authorized the imposition of attorney's fees and related expenses as a sanction); *Malautea v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 987 F.2d 1536, 1545-46 (11th Cir. 1993) (finding that the court's inherent power to manage actions before it permitted the imposition of fines), *cert. denied*, 510 U.S. 863, 114 S.Ct. 181, 126 L.Ed.2d 140 (1993); *Blunt v. U. S. Tobacco Co.*, 856 F.2d 192 (6th Cir. 1988) (unpublished) (affirming district court's dismissal of *pro se* plaintiff's action for failure to prosecute when plaintiff failed to respond to the summary judgment notice or to show cause why the action should not be dismissed).

DONE this 7th day of February, 2012.

s/WILLIAM E. CASSADY
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S EXPLANATION OF PROCEDURAL RIGHTS
AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATION
AND FINDINGS CONCERNING NEED FOR TRANSCRIPT

1. **Objection.** Any party who objects to this recommendation or anything in it must, within fourteen days of the date of service of this document, file specific written objections with the clerk of court. Failure to do so will bar a de novo determination by the district judge of anything in the recommendation and will bar an attack, on appeal, of the factual findings of the magistrate judge. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); Lewis v. Smith, 855 F.2d 736, 738 (11th Cir. 1988); Nettles v. Wainwright, 677 F.2d 404 (5th Cir. Unit B, 1982)(en banc). The procedure for challenging the findings and recommendations of the magistrate judge is set out in more detail in SD ALA LR 72.4 (June 1, 1997), which provides that:

A party may object to a recommendation entered by a magistrate judge in a dispositive matter, that is, a matter excepted by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A), by filing a "Statement of Objection to Magistrate Judge's Recommendation" within fourteen days after being served with a copy of the recommendation, unless a different time is established by order. The statement of objection shall specify those portions of the recommendation to which objection is made and the basis for the objection. The objecting party shall submit to the district judge, at the time of filing the objection, a brief setting forth the party's arguments that the magistrate judge's recommendation should be reviewed de novo and a different disposition made. It is insufficient to submit only a copy of the original brief submitted to the magistrate judge, although a copy of the original brief may be submitted or referred to and incorporated into the brief in support of the objection. Failure to submit a brief in support of the objection may be deemed an abandonment of the objection.

A magistrate judge's recommendation cannot be appealed to a Court of Appeals; only the district judge's order or judgment can be appealed.

2. **Transcript (applicable where proceedings tape recorded).** Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915 and Fed.R.Civ.P. 72(b), the magistrate judge finds that the tapes and original records in this action are adequate for purposes of review. Any party planning to object to this recommendation, but unable to pay the fee for a transcript, is advised that a judicial determination that transcription is necessary is required before the United States will pay the cost of the transcript.